

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE
EASTERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

FILED

DEC 04 2007

William B. Guthrie
Clerk, U.S. District Court

By _____ Deputy Clerk

FRANK SANCHEZ,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT KING, et al.,

Defendants.

No. CIV 07-039-RAW-SPS

OPINION AND ORDER
DENYING MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

Plaintiff has filed a motion requesting the court to appoint counsel [Docket No. 30]. He bears the burden of convincing the court that his claim has sufficient merit to warrant appointment of counsel. *McCarthy v. Weinberg*, 753 F.2d 836, 838 (10th Cir. 1985) (citing *United States v. Masters*, 484 F.2d 1251, 1253 (10th Cir. 1973)). The court has carefully reviewed the merits of plaintiff's claims, the nature of factual issues raised in his allegations, and his ability to investigate crucial facts. *McCarthy*, 753 F.2d at 838 (citing *Maclin v. Freake*, 650 F.2d 885, 887-88 (7th Cir. 1981)). After considering plaintiff's ability to present his claims and the complexity of the legal issues raised by the claims, the court finds that appointment of counsel is not warranted. *See Williams v. Meese*, 926 F.2d 994, 996 (10th Cir. 1991); *see also Rucks v. Boergermann*, 57 F.3d 978, 979 (10th Cir. 1995). ACCORDINGLY, plaintiff's motion is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of December 2007.



RONALD A. WHITE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE